

**College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, February 3, 2026
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Administrative Conference Room 1901; virtual option via Zoom**

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: January 20, 2026	Motion to approve M/S (Gilstrap, Draper). Approved.
2. Report Out from CCC Members	<p>Speaker: All Apprenticeship: Kaupp noted reps unavailable due to travel/scheduling conflicts.</p> <p>BSS: Lew shared that due to interest in Certified Wellness Coaching cert. being developed, division has been gathering more info about details (especially courses included) to bring back to CCC.</p> <p>Counseling: Jackson-Sandoval shared working on Courses not Taught in Four Years list.</p> <p>Fine Arts & Comm.: Walgren shared Photography dept. working on new certs.; working on Courses not Taught in Four Years list.</p> <p>HSH: No updates to report.</p> <p>Kinesiology: No updates to report.</p> <p>Language Arts: No updates to report.</p> <p>LRC: No updates to report.</p> <p>SRC: No updates to report.</p> <p>STEM: No updates to report.</p> <p>Gilstrap shared news of new ADTs in Biology 2.0 and Music Industry Studies, plus update to Chemistry ADT. Noted currently Foothill is out of compliance by not offering Chemistry ADT because we can't get our courses to fit the units required by current TMC, but this new TMC will allow us to create it! Waiting on state Chancellor's Office to release submission forms, which he will work on w/ faculty. Next, shared big Common Course Numbering (CCN) news released yesterday: the state has decided to put a pause on CCN Phase 3, citing need for willingness by UC & CSU to approve CCN templates. Current process of still requiring individual course submissions for transfer approval is resulting in inequities for students. Brief discussion re: different types of articulation. Later this month, Foothill will meet w/ state Chancellor's Office and other quarter schools to discuss CCN for quarter schools. Next, shared he will be attending Credit for Prior Learning convening at Cabrillo on Friday. Lastly, shared he's continuing work re: catalog rights and continuous enrollment; has met with a few deans to discuss new language for CCC to review and discuss, and has reached out to ASFC President to ensure student input.</p> <p>Hueg noted will also be attending CPL convening. Mentioned upcoming transition from TOP Codes to CIP Codes; Vanatta mentioned webinar tomorrow should provide details so we can begin process. Hueg noted</p>

	<p>required to transition by fall 2027 but we've already started some work behind the scenes. Brief discussion re: what TOP Codes are used for.</p> <p>Vanatta shared deadline for curriculum sheets for next year's catalog will be April 17. Expects catalog system to be open for edits no later than March 9, and noted this is similar to last year's timeline.</p> <p>Kaupp shared this quarter he's been involved in more curriculum discussions between Foothill and De Anza than usual and encouraged folks to continue to reach out to him for advice and support if interested in discussing new curriculum w/ De Anza. Also shared details about discussion at yesterday's FHDA Board meeting re: updated language related to minimum units for certificates of achievement on a Board Policy; he is working w/ colleagues to ensure language is accurate.</p>
3. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda	No comments.
4. Announcements a. New Course Proposal	Speakers: CCC Team The following proposal was presented: APPT 147C.
5. Division Curriculum Committees	Speaker: Ben Kaupp Document includes details about each division CC. Kaupp noted no updates since previous version. Motion to approve M/S (Taylor, Agyare). Approved.
6. GE Application: Area 1B: COMM 54A	Speaker: Ben Kaupp Second read of GE application for Area 1B, Oral Communication & Critical Thinking, for COMM 54A. <i>See item 12 for comments and motion/approval details.</i>
7. GE Application: Area 1B: COMM 54B	Speaker: Ben Kaupp Second read of GE application for Area 1B, Oral Communication & Critical Thinking, for COMM 54B. <i>See item 12 for comments and motion/approval details.</i>
8. GE Application: Area 1B: COMM 54C	Speaker: Ben Kaupp Second read of GE application for Area 1B, Oral Communication & Critical Thinking, for COMM 54C. <i>See item 12 for comments and motion/approval details.</i>
9. GE Application: Area 3: HUMN 17	Speaker: Ben Kaupp Second read of GE application for Area 3, Arts & Humanities, for HUMN 17. <i>See item 12 for comments and motion/approval details.</i>
10. GE Application: Area 4: PSYC 45	Speaker: Ben Kaupp Second read of GE application for Area 4, Social & Behavioral Sciences, for PSYC 45. <i>See item 12 for comments and motion/approval details.</i>
11. GE Application: Area 7: PHDA 15B	Speaker: Ben Kaupp Second read of GE application for Area 7, Lifelong Learning, for PHDA 15B. <i>See item 12 for comments and motion/approval details.</i>
12. GE Application: Area 7: PSYC 53	Speaker: Ben Kaupp Second read of GE application for Area 7, Lifelong Learning, for PSYC 53.

	<p>General comment made that some GE apps were filled out in such a way that made it seem like the faculty felt they must complete all Breadth Mapping questions, even if some did not apply; this supports updating Breadth Mapping instructions to add clarity.</p> <p>Group agreed to vote on items 6-12 together.</p> <p>Motion to approve items 6-12 M/S (Sinclair, Lew). Approved.</p>
<p>13. Stand Alone Application: APPT 121A</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp First read of Stand Alone application for APPT 121A. Will be temporarily Stand Alone and included in a new degree.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>14. Stand Alone Application: APPT 128I</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp First read of Stand Alone application for APPT 128I. Will be temporarily Stand Alone and included in a new degree.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>15. Stand Alone Applications: CWE 60A, 65A, 65B, 65C, 65D</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp First read of Stand Alone application for CWE 60A, 65A, 65B, 65C & 65D. All five will be permanently Stand Alone. Vanatta noted courses were previously included on Plumbing Technology AS degree but have been removed, so Stand Alone approval is needed.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>16. Stand Alone Application: JRYM 100</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp First read of Stand Alone application for JRYM 100. Will be permanently Stand Alone. Kaupp shared info from division, this course helps Apprenticeship instructors with teaching strategies and professional development.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>17. Stand Alone Application: R T 473</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp First read of Stand Alone application for R T 473. Will be permanently Stand Alone. Vanatta noted app. previously had first read during fall quarter, but faculty given approval to make some major updates to the course, so CCC Team decided to start approval process over. Draper noted Advisory Board for discipline in support of the course.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>18. Courses not Taught in Four Years</p>	<p>Speaker: Mary Vanatta Vanatta distributed list to reps and deans with instructions/deadline on Jan. 27; deadline for Course Deactivation Exemption Request forms is March 6, which will be voted on at March 17 CCC meeting. Vanatta explained history behind this process, and outlined steps to request a course remain active. Kaupp noted this process is a helpful opportunity for depts. to think about whether or not a course which has not been offered in many years should remain on the books.</p>
<p>19. Foothill GE Application Criteria: Area 5</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp Today's discussion is about Depth Criteria/Mapping for Area 5: Natural Sciences (with Lab). Kaupp noted this particular form received a lot of attention when it was updated last year.</p> <p>Kaupp noted suggestion received from Sinclair, re: Mandatory Lab Outcome 2: per STEM constituent feedback, replace "research laboratories" with "scientific research," with the reason being some sciences don't take place in traditional lab setting. Taylor noted he gave a lot of thought to how questions are formatted (i.e., separate outcomes</p>

	<p>for lecture and lab portions) but wasn't able to come up with a better solution. Kaupp believes it makes sense to keep questions separate, considering lecture and lab are distinct portions of course. Sinclair added that in some cases the lab is actually a different course, so it makes sense to have separate questions. Gilstrap asked how GE app would be handled in unlikely situation that faculty creating separate new courses for lecture and lab—Vanatta suggested could enter “N/A” on questions which don't pertain (e.g., on lecture outcomes for lab course), or fully complete form on both courses, using same answers.</p> <p>Kaupp mentioned standard across all forms to include 5 Mandatory Outcomes + 5 Optional Outcomes (requiring 2 of the latter), noting Area 5 form is doubled due to separate lecture/lab sections. Believes this strikes a good balance of rigor without unnecessary busywork, but is open to suggestions from the group. Sinclair believes mandatory outcomes solidify the focus of the course, with optional outcomes acknowledging additional aspects that merit attention. Agyare noted on some forms the optional outcomes seem to be a subset of the mandatory. Sinclair commented that optional outcomes on Area 5 app are more related to a specific focus of the course, but agreed she's felt similarly when looking some of the other forms. Agyare noted the use of discipline-focused wording could be the cause of some uncertainty when reviewing these forms.</p> <p>Kaupp noted if the group decides to stick with 5+5 we are responsible for making sure the mandatory outcomes reflect what we want to be absolutely present in a course meeting a specific GE area. Noted that this is probably easier for Area 5 than it is for a broader GE area, such as Area 7.</p> <p>Kaupp hopes to have time soon to create shared OneDrive folder with updated forms, for folks to review and provide additional feedback.</p>
<p>20. Foothill GE Application Breadth Criteria and Breadth Mapping</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp First read of updated Foothill GE Breadth Criteria and Breadth Mapping, which will be included on all Foothill GE application forms. Draft is based on feedback that the current format of Breadth Mapping is confusing and suggestion to prompt for one short essay-style response. Was briefly discussed at previous meeting; no edits have been made.</p> <p>Kaupp is open to any and all feedback and encouraged the group to share their thoughts. Agyare noted Information and Digital Literacy wasn't actually ever an Institutional Learning Outcome (ILO) but was added by CCC during earlier revision of GE app forms. Kaupp asked the group for thoughts on prompting for one essay-style response instead of using multiple questions. Walgren mentioned she's recently been moving away from essays in favor of research portfolios. Sinclair mentioned recent review of GE apps for CCC, noticing some faculty included large volume of info in their responses. Brannvall asked what CCC is hoping to see in responses to such a prompt—Kaupp responded, goal is for CCC to not have to ask any follow-up questions when reviewing a GE app. Brannvall agreed, and suggested adding to the instructions prompts for faculty to demonstrate connections to specific COR sections/content. Likes the idea of having an essay-style question but wants to ensure responses include specifics.</p> <p>Gilstrap in general likes the essay-style question, which should provide an open look into how the faculty member believes their course fulfills GE. Noted process currently involves simply copying/pasting from</p>

	<p>COR, and believes including both essay-style response and copy/paste from COR is better. Believes format would help faculty think about how courses align to ILOs and be intentional about that aspect of course development.</p> <p>Agyare wonders if Breadth Mapping responses could eventually be used to evaluate which courses address each ILO, and noted might be harder to do this using single essay-style question. Sinclair suggested including check-box (or similar) for each ILO, for faculty to indicate which ILOs the course aligns with. Kaupp suggested updating instructions to better clarify course not required to meet all ILOs, and brainstormed requiring an “artifact” from COR (or program data) plus short response explaining how that artifact relates to course/program meeting each applicable ILO. Wonders if draft is currently too vague. Sinclair asked for clarification re: “artifact” and wonders if faculty will have this in mind when developing a new course. Also noted that historically we’ve looked for ways to document that students are satisfying ILOs, and it sounds like we’re intending to say that by completing Foothill GE students are satisfying them; noted check-box method suggested earlier would help gather data to determine if/how courses align to ILOs. Kaupp believes there’s been an assumption that if student takes enough courses they’re likely to satisfy all ILOs, but believes there is a push to formalize this. Kaupp explained had nothing specific in mind for “artifact” and is open to interpretation on how the group would define that, including how broadly.</p> <p>Kaupp acknowledged edits are needed and asked the group if essay-style prompt preferred over current multi-question format. Sinclair believes it would be helpful to ask which specific ILOs the course aligns with (e.g., check-boxes), and include the essay-style prompt. Walgren suggested using one question per ILO—Kaupp noted this is the current format. Kaupp agrees it’s a good idea to require faculty specify which ILOs the course aligns with, and will edit draft accordingly. Again asked the group to decide which format is preferred. Brannvall suggested one question per ILO or using Sinclair’s check-box suggestion, plus additional general question. Draper believes using separate ILO questions + general essay-style question will likely result in more useful responses (for CCC review) than using single essay-style question. Kaupp asked the group to continue to share feedback, so he can thoughtfully update draft for second read at next meeting.</p>
21. Good of the Order	
22. Adjournment	3:28 PM

Attendees: Micaela Agyare* (LRC), Jeff Bissell (KA), Cynthia Brannvall* (FAC), Zach Cembellin* (Dean, STEM), Cathy Draper* (HSH), Angie Dupree (BSS), Rachael Dworsky (LA), John Fox (BSS), Evan Gilstrap* (Articulation Officer), Ron Herman* (Dean, FAC), Kurt Hueg* (Administrator Co-Chair), Maritza Jackson Sandoval* (CNSL), Ben Kaupp* (Faculty Co-Chair), Andy Lee (CNSL), Laurence Lew* (BSS), Richard Saroyan (SRC), Jennifer Sinclair* (STEM), Kyle Taylor* (STEM), Mary Vanatta* (Curriculum Coordinator), Judy Walgren* (FAC), Sam White* (LA)

* Indicates in-person attendance

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta